DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 599 SO 017 630

AUTHOR Ben-Peretz, Miriam
TITLE Time: The Fifth Commonplace in Curricular Deliberations.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Interaction; Learning Processes; *Scheduling; Teacher Education; *Time Factors (Learning); *Time on Task

ABSTRACT

Contending that the four commonplaces of defensible educational thought (the learner, the teacher, the milieu, and the subject matter) do not deal with the complexities of time and its implications for curriculum and instruction, this paper presents time as a crucial element in curricular deliberation. Various aspects of time in the school setting are presented and their implications for curriculum and instruction are discussed. A distinction is made between instructional time, curricular time, sociological time, and experienced, personal time. These distinctions do not represent a full and comprehensive framework for the study of time, but serve as constructs guiding the discussion of time as a commonplace in education. The paper argues that time constitutes a special commonplace, not to be subsumed under the four commonplaces mentioned above. Part of the potential knowledge base and body of experience needed to represent this commonplace is noted, and implications for research, curriculum development, and teacher education are made. A three-page list of references concludes the document. (SY)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED275599

# TIME: THE FIFTH COMMONPLACE IN CURRICULAR DELIBERATIONS

Miriam Ben-Peretz

University of Haifa
Israel

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Miriam Ben-Peretz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP017630

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1986, San Francisco.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper sets out to present time as a crucial contributing element to curricular deliberations. According to Schwab (1973) defensible educational thought must coordinate four commonplaces: the learner, the teacher, the milieu and the subject matter. It is contended, herewith, that the usual "agenda of commonplaces" (Schwab, 1983, p. 256), does not deal with the complexities of time and its educational implications for curriculum and instruction, and that a special "representative" is needed, whose contribution to curricular deliberations will be in the area of understanding of issues concerning time in education.

The paper starts with an examination of time as this construct is used in current educational literature. Various aspects of time in the school setting are presented and their implications for curriculum and instruction are discussed. For sake of discussion a distinction is made between instructional time, curricular time, sociological time and experienced, personal, time though in school life these overlap. These distinctions are not to be understood as representing a full and comprehensive framework for the study of time, they serve as constructs guiding the discussion of time as a commonplace in education. It is argued that "time" constitutes a special commonplace, not to be subsumed under the four commonplaces mentioned above. Part of the potential knowledge base and body of experience needed to represent this commonplace is noted and some implications for research, curriculum development and teacher education are referred to.

Instructional Time

Instructional time is defined as classroom time, allocated and prescribed by teachers, engaged in and used by students.

In educational literature, one finds time to play an ever growing role as a measurement variable (Fisher and Berliner, 1985). In educational and psychological research schooling has been analyzed using time as a yardstick, a metric, a proxy for educational events. This research has yielded interesting and valuable insight into the learning-teaching process and has introduced a number of new and important concepts into the language of education (Carroll, 1963; Bloom, 1974, Harnischfeger and Wiley, 1976; Rosenshine, 1979; Berliner, 1979; Fisher et al., 1978; among others). Concepts like "allocated time" "engaged time" or "academic learning time," provide us with tantalizing glimpses into the intricacies of the teaching-learning process and the mediating factors between teachers' actions and students' achievements. As more attention was given to concerns related to instructional time new questions were raised and it seems that we are at present in an era of a rapidly developing research domain. Let us turn to some of these questions and issues and note their significance for time as a commonplace in education.

Gage (1978), while stressing the importance of time as a factor in the learning process, claims that "academic learning time...is, in a sense, a psychologically empty quantitative concept. We need better analyses of how that time is filled, of what learning processes go on during academic learning time" (p. 75). Jackson (1977) warns educators, intent on seizing at remedies for educational ailments that "we must keep in mind that time itself is valueless. It acquires value chiefly

because it marks the expenditure of a precious commodity, human life....The real key lies in making better use of the time we already have" (p. 38).

Gage seems to direct us to more careful and systematic research efforts, linking allocation of time, engaged time and academic learning time to an awareness of the specific learning process and the time requirements of different students. Possible research questions are: what are some of the implications of differential time allotment in various subject matter areas to teaching of specifics and to teaching of rules and generalizations? What are some of the implications of various time combinations of individual, group and whole class learning? Answers to such questions may be viewed as essential for a better understanding of instructional time and for the application of this understanding to curriculum and instruction.

Jackson's warning has been an enlightening message for anyone concerned with educational planning. Busy with efforts of curriculum development and implementation, trying to include more subject matter areas and more learning activities in crowded school days, we may tend to overlook the basic issue raised by Jackson namely, the issue of the expenditure of human life. Is it really necessary to spend 12, 16, or even 20 or more years of human life on formal institutional learning? How can we intensify the learning process so as to make temporal room for initiation into other "worthwhile activities," (Peters, 1967) beyond learning of the disciplines (Martin, 1970)? The problem posed by Jackson, how to make better use of the time we already have, can be related to the questions raised by economists, concerning the economics

of student time. Levin and Tsang (1984) raise serious doubts about the efficacy of mechanical increases in instructional time on achievement. According to the economic model employed by Levin and Tsang a rather small increase in educational achievement is predicted, relative to rather substantial increases in instructional time. Moreover, other educational interventions, making different use of existing school time, may be preferable (Levin, et al., 1984). Karweit's (1985) work supports these cautions. "Using optimistic goals of increasing attendance from 93% to 95%, days of the school year from 179 to 180, and hours per day from 6.4 to 7, we find that the achievement effect of those increases would be quite minimal" (Karweit, 1985, p. 172).

Careful research in the use of instructional time as reported on by Leinhardt (1985) reveals interesting insights into the nature of time in classrooms. Leinhardt suggests several basic findings that emerge from her review of this research. These findings are considered to support the claim for time as a commonplace in education. Leinhardt suggests that time is a metric, that allows us to scale variables in an additive way. Yet, behaviors that have been scaled in the metric of time "appear to have an equivalence that may be false. One minute of teacher behavior in category Y is not the same as one minute of student behavior in category X. Issues of intensity and density need to be addressed" (Leinhardt, 1985, p. 277). One might add to that that one minute of teacher A behavior in category Y may not be the same as one minute of teacher B behavior in the same category. Issues of intensity and density have to be studied and are considered to be components of time as a commonplace. Another finding discussed by Leinhardt is that time

is overlapping and not mutually exclusive. In Leinhardt's words: "school behaviors go on at once for a given child or teacher. Two or more things can occur simultaneously so that independent measurement of conceptually separate variables becomes difficult to interpret (ibid., p. 177). This finding may lead to a definite role for the representative of "time" in curricular deliberations, as a cautious interpreter of data provided by "time on task" studies. Another of Leinhardt's findings may be valuable to curriculum developers. "Allocated time may not be the upper bound for engaged time" (ibid., p. 177). There seems to be a delicate balance of payoff between time allocations in various subject matter areas. "Time spent on social studies or science will also have a payoff in the area known as reading comprehension" (ibid., p. 248). Research on the nature of these possible payoffs and time overlapping, mentioned above, may become part of the experience and expertise of the representative of time in curricular deliberations. These comments are not meant as a negation of the importance of the concept of instructional time in education. Rather, it is claimed that these issues have to be treated explicitly, and in a concerted manner, and integrated as a commonplace in curricular deliberations. The "agents of translation," suggested by Schwab (1973) as representing the bodies of knowledge and experience in the four commonplace areas, may tend to view issues of instructional time in a fragmented manner, lacking an appropriate overview of the various concerns related to time in instruction. We shall now turn to a consideration of curricular time.

Curricular Time

Curricular time is defined as time allocations and specifications for time use prescribed by curriculum developers. The issue of time allocations in the curriculum was mentioned in the foregoing paragraph in relation to Jackson's (1977) claim about the value of time. Viewing time as a curricular resource, Fenstermacher (1985) argues that it is important to include low-specification outcomes in the curriculum, especially in the affective domain. Teachers cannot be held accountable for the achievement of these outcomes, but they should be held accountable in a task sense of teaching. According to Fenstermacher, research on teaching provides a standard for appraising teaching in the task sense. This standard is time engaged in activities which are perceived as potentially leading to the desired outcomes. "Time is the terminus of teaching, no matter which form the outcomes take" (Fenstermacher, 1985, p. 107). This approach calls for goal extension in the curriculum to include important areas of feelings, emotions, values and character development. In a sense Fenstermacher joins Martin (1970) and Peters (1967) in a claim to allocate time sources in the curriculum to issues that are beyond the teaching of the disciplines or basic skills. In curricular deliberations time becomes a scarce resource hotly competed for. It is, therefore, deemed necessary to focus explicitly on time issues, not just as an offshoot of considerations stemming from the other commonplaces. How can time considerations be treated in a defensible manner in these deliberations? Several possible answers may be suggested.

Anderson (1985) proposes conceptions of timing, several of which seem to be important for curriculum deliberations. Thus, from a developmental perspective, "the problem of timing is one of designing curricula that are in line with the developmental capabilities of the learners, what should be taught when and how should the 'what' be sequenced" (Anderson, 1985, p. 161). Another concept discussed by Anderson is the concept of entry behavior timing, timing within a particular developmental stage. This issue, too, has implications for curriculum and for instruction. These are not novel ideas, yet it seems that without a relevant research base, and lacking a special "voice" in curricular deliberations, these considerations tend to be overlooked.

An interesting and potentially fruitful approach to the effects of curricular timing is suggested by Karweit (1985). A key principle in her dynamic model of teacher-learner-task interaction is that timing effects are of consequence to learning. "The same duration of learning time may have quite different effects because some ways of organizing instructional time may be more efficient for learning than others" (Karweit, 1985, p. 173). The units of time referred to by Karweit may be hours, days, years or even seconds. Non-active and active learning periods are arranged on a cyclic basis. According to Karweit, decisions on these "on" and "off" periods have to be carefully deliberated. In part, these are decisions related to school time-tables and to the curriculum. Thus, one may decide to alternate math and science on a yearly or monthly basis. One may, also, for example, decide to alternate "on" and "off" periods in the teaching of photosynthesis in a special way that may be considered to promote learning effectiveness.

At present, we probably do not know enough to make sound and defensible decisions in these matters. A growing knowledge on the effects of timing and duration may provide a better basis for deliberations on these issues. Karweit distinguishes between hierarchical subject matter areas, such as mathematics, and non-hierarchical subject matter areas, such as French and suggests that the effects of pacing instruction in these areas will differ. This is another example for the importance of timing decisions in curricular deliberations. The concept of "time scales" of learning events is proposed by Karweit as an useful tool in making timing decisions. By "time scale," Karweit means the time over which factors affecting the learning rate are in effect. Knowledge about time scales could inform classroom decisions of allotting instructional time. Such knowledge could also prove valuable in decision-making regarding the structure of the school year, or in decisions about what types of curricula can best be taught intensively in a concurrent or separate manner. According to Karweit, "the degree of structure of the curriculum can be expressed in terms of the amount of time it takes for learning efficiency to be reduced" (Karweit, 1985, p. 184). Knowledge of and experience in the use of time scales, could be one of the expertise areas of the "representative" of the time commonplace in curriculum deliberation.

We turn now to another aspect of time which we consider to be vital for curriculum development and implementation, namely, sociological time, or the "sociotemporal order" (Zerubavel, 1981).

Sociological Time

Sociological time, the sociotemporal order, is defined as "the way time is perceived and handled by collectivities" (Zerubavel, 1981, p. xii). Zerubavel (1981) claims that though time is one of the most central dimensions of the social world, it has been a neglected focus of study in the social sciences. Zerubavel distinguishes between different temporal orders, the natural physiotemporal and biotemporal orders, and the sociotemporal order which is a "socially constructed artifact" (p. xii). Zerubavel explores four major forms of temporal regularity, studied by him in the context of hospital life and monasteries. Zerubavel associates patterns of social events and activities with rigid sequential structures, fixed durations, standard temporal locations and uniform rates of occurrence. Though sequential order of events may be random, it is often rigidly structured in social life. Schools provide a perfect example of a rigid sequential order as students move from grade to grade in a predetermined sequence. It is usually not the case that students can move backwards and forwards in this sequence according to their interests or inclination. One may perceive the sequence of raising one's hand before speaking in class as an example of a sequential structure in time. Curriculum units are, sometimes, presented to teachers as bearing the stamp of inevitable sequential structure. According to Zerubavel, "many socially based irreversibilities are purely symbolic in nature" (p. 4). Thus, the sequential structure of curricula may be "natural," if it is based on inherent characteristics of the subject matter. On the other hand, this imposed irreversibility may be understood to symbolize the power structure of schools and subject matter experts.

Durational rigidity, another facet of temporal regularity, characterizes many of the events and activities taking place in schools. Zerubavel regards the fixed duration of many events as expressions of conventions which create certain temporal expectations in the participants. Exceptions to expected durations may bear symbolic overtones, such as leaving "too early" or staying "too late." In schools conventions of temporal duration may be extremely important and may have far-reaching consequences. For example, curriculum changes in the expected duration of laboratory work, in innovative science curricula, may add to the difficulties of implementation. As the study of pathological physiological processes provides insights into the normal process, so the study of deviant temporal events may yield insights into the nature of schooling. The standardization of temporal locations, which presupposes scheduling, is viewed by Zerubavel as a phenomenon of western culture. The association of social activities and events with standard temporal locations, such as going to school at a certain hour, is considered by Zerubavel to reflect societal norms. "Fixing the temporal locations of events entails a broadly conceived norm of 'punctuality', which involves assigning a deviant character to the acts of being 'early' or 'late' (Zerubavel, 1981, p. 8). Planning of schooling, curriculum development and instruction tend to impose norms of temporal location. These may be perceived as "unnatural" by students and may lead to the rejection of planned learning events. How is learning affected by standard temporal locations, e.g., laboratories, seminar rooms, lecture halls? What would happen if these were changed?

Answer to these, and similar questions would enhance the validity of curricular and instructional considerations.

Rhytmicity, the uniform rate of recurrence, is characteristic of formal organizations, such as schools. Zerubavel notes that social rhytmicity is "often quite independent of natural rhytmicity...sometimes even conflicts with it" (ibid., p. 11). The impact of social rhytmicity on school life and the detrimental effects of possible conflict situations necessitate careful investigation.

Zerubavel emphasizes the cognitive implication of temporal regularity which "adds a strong touch of predictability to the world around us, thus, enhancing our cognitive well-being" (ibid., p. 12). It may well be that innovative curricula lessen the predictability of an otherwise fairly regular temporal environment, leading to a sense of cognitive uneasiness in teachers and students. "Cognitive well-being" is not a clearly defined term, still, the notion of temporal expectancies and their relationship to cognitive dimensions of schooling may prove to be fruitful for conducting research on curricular issues.

Zerubavel proposes two further sets of distinctions in his analysis of the socio-temporal order which seem relevant to inquiry into the processes of schooling. One distinction is between private time and public time. According to Zerubavel, time serves the important function of keeping the private and public spheres of life apart. "Time functions as one of the major dimensions of social organization along which involvement, commitment, and accessibility are defined and regulated in modern society" (ibid., p. 141). This function of time is noticeable in schools where teachers, for instance, may be expected to

be on "private time" during breaks. Students, though, are rarely afforded the luxury of "private time" during school hours, not even during breaks. One can well imagine a variety of educational implications which would ensue if students were granted periods of "private time" in school. The experience of schooling as an enforced and compulsory situation may conceivably change. On the other hand, imagine a school, such as the Kibbutz school, in which teachers have almost no "private time" and are expected to be available to their students at all times, even after school hours. This situation leads to a radically different relationship between teachers and students.

Another distinction suggested by Zerubavel, following Durkheim (1965), is between "sacred" and "profane" time. As is the case with private and public time, this distinction delineates a qualitative conception of time, as an entity which is imbued with meaning. Religious people experience both sacred time and profane time, the former would have been meaningless were it not contrasted with the latter. While sacred time and profane time ought to be separated from one another, there must also be some way of passing from one to the other. "the same boundaries which seem to separate sacred time from profane time also seem to allow the transition between them" (ibid., p. 126). Zerubavel analyzes several examples of such boundaries which serve also as transition periods.

Attempting to apply the concepts of sacred time, profane time, boundaries and transition time, to school life could provide important insights into school situations. Transitions, for instance, which are sometimes considered to be wasted time, may serve an important function

as boundaries between qualitatively different segments of school time. The notion of "sacred" versus "profane" time, if applied to schools and curricula, may have interesting implications. It may be important to introduce periods of "sacred" time into schools, not necessarily in the religious sense, but in the sense of student and teacher involvement with problems and issues of ethics. School festivities and traditions may also acquire a "sacred" status, in a non-religious sense, that may contribute to the creation of a distinct school ethos. In Israel, memorial ceremonies held in schools on certain dates acquire this aura of sacred time.

Zerubavel's framework of a sociotemporal order is viewed as a possible framework for looking at schooling and curricula which could become part of the knowledge base of the "agent" of time in curricular deliberations. Let us know turn briefly to another way of conceptualizing sociotemporal time, through the use of the concept of rhythm in social behavior (Mathiot and Carlock, 1982). Rhythm is defined by the authors as: "the patterned rate of occurrence in ongoing behavior of points of perceptional prominence within specified units of the behavioral flow" (ibid., p. 177). In this framework it is possible to distinguish between a very regular, smooth, rhythm, and highly irregular or erratic rhythms. These may be expressed in speech flow units or in body movements. In both cases, such an analysis may be relevant to the investigation of school curriculum issues, such as second language acquisition. Another concept in the realm of rhythm in social behavior is the concept of synchrony, the systematic co-occurrence of rhythmic patterns. The absence of interactional

synchrony may be interpreted as "clues for lack of cultural sharing on the part of participants" (ibid., p. 178).

Condon (1982) believes that synchrony is an inevitable feature of conversational interaction, which is the most prominent characteristic of learning situations in classrooms. Kendon (1982) claims that we are rarely aware of the extent that synchrony is part of human interaction. "When we do become aware of the coordination of action between ourselves and our co-interactants, it seems that this can have quite powerful consequences for our feeling for and apprehension of the other" (Kendon, 1982, p. 358).

Synchrony may prove to be another useful concept for the understanding of schooling events. Appropriate questions could be: are teachers aware of the synchrony phenomenon? How can such an awareness contribute to effective teaching? Can we introduce deliberate learning activities into the curriculum, that would lead to a greater measure of synchrony among participants and, possibly promote cultural sharing?

The sociotemporal order is a growing field of study. Several of its concepts were presented above and some possible implication for curriculum and instruction were proposed. The reason for presenting these concepts and for pointing to their potential educational implication is to make a case for time as a legitimate "commonplace" in curricular deliberation. We turn now to the last aspect of time to be discussed, experienced, personal time.

Experienced, Personal Time

Experienced, personal time is defined as the perception of temporal order by individuals. Individuals perceive time in different ways and may be viewed as assigning personal meaning to time. Connelly and Clandinin (1985) discuss ways in which teachers and students know the cyclic-temporal order of classrooms. They have identified school cycles and describe how these may be experienced by different school participants. In one of their examples, they discuss the Christmas break which may be experienced by some students as a time to prepare for examinations and by others as a time to relax. Teachers may experience the break as off duty private time and janitors as on duty time. According to Connelly and Clandinin the cyclic temporal ordering of schools is significant in terms of student growth and curriculum sequence. Connelly and Clandinin have identified nine school cycles according to their temporal duration: annual, holiday, monthly, weekly, six-day, duty, day, teacher and report cycles. They state that "from the point of view of the experience of schooling, then, there are, following Dewey (1938), personal and existential sides to the cyclic, temporal, structure of school life. Schedules, calendars, and other cycles have a conventionally defined objective status from the point of view of the individual. Rhythms are cycles translated by an individual's experience and are, therefore, personal. Cycles may be described in objective terms; rhythms require a language of affect. Cycles tend to be specified in print for all to follow as, for example, a school schedule, whereas rhythms are, as Zerubavel might say, "hidden" and can only be reconstructed from an individual's experience. Cycles

are seen as objective, required, orderings; rhythms are felt as subjective aesthetic and moral orderings" (ibid., p. 4).

Connelly and Clandinin discuss the personal, existential, side of time as experienced in schools. It is contended that this aspect of time should become part of curricular deliberations. In order to strengthen the case for time as a commonplace let us turn to other frameworks of conceptualizing time in education. These frameworks could, conceivably, find their way into curricular deliberations through a comprehensive view of time as a commonplace. The notion of the personal meaning of time is highlighted in Rousseau's dictum that the most important educational principle is to "lose time." This principle may be understood to mean that the growth and development of man should not be dictated by the tyranny of the clock. Each person is conceived as an individual, different from others. Therefore, each has his or her own pace of development and the passage of time is experienced by each in a unique manner. What are the possible curricular implications of such a stance? Is it but another way of legitimizing individualized learning? Still, even individual learning is not free from the tyranny of the clock, there exists a pervasive climate of pressure for efficiency in learning. What does it mean "to lose time?" Will the "losing of time" prove to be a liberating experience for students? If we wish to adopt Rousseau's principle, how do we incorporate it into modern curricula? These and other questions could be raised by "representatives" of time in curricular deliberation.

Another issue that is related to a personal, experiental view of time, is the distinction between play time and work time which

characterizes much of schooling. As long ago as the early nineteenth century, the German philosopher, Schleiermacher (1835-1864) argued for an integration between play and work in the learning process: According to Schleiermacher, it is unethical to sacrifice the present moment for a future one. The pedagogical moment, which is future oriented, has to be meaningful for the learner in his or her present state. Integration of future orientation and personal meaning is, in Schleiermacher's view, the basis for a morally justified educational process. Kron (1968), following Schleiermacher, suggests that modern education has to build on a sensitive understanding of the meaning of time, present and future, for individual learners.

The various approaches to personally experienced time, mentioned above, may be consequential for curriculum development and for instruction. The question is, who is to speak on these issues in the process of educational decision making?

Why a Separate Commonplace?

The kaleidoscopic overview of a variety of approaches to the study of time presented so far is not to be understood as a search for a comprehensive theory of time as a commonplace in education. The study of time is based on different conceptions and operates by means of a variety of methodological approaches. In Schwab's terms, knowledge about time is produced by means of various substantive and syntactical structures (Schwab, 1964). It is contended that this knowledge could become a fruitful element in the process of curriculum development and has to be represented in curricular deliberations. Someone, who is familiar with knowledge about time, who is aware of the variety of

possible approaches to the study of time, and sensitive to the issues and concerns related to time, has to participate in the collaborative attempt of planning curriculum and instruction.

One may claim that issues related to time could be presented by the agents representing the four commonplaces, subject matter, learners, milieu and teachers. Thus, concerns about students' use of time could be raised by representatives of learners and the sociotemporal aspects could be covered by representatives of milieu. Yet, there is a danger that such representation would be fragmentary and incidental. For the "agents of translation" (Schwab, 1973), involved in curriculum making, time is but one of many issues and concerns. Participants who represent a body of knowledge about, and experience with learners, for example, may be expected to possess information about manifold concerns. Schwab (1973) suggests the need for general, as well as particular, knowledge about the age group under consideration, what it knows and what it is ready to learn, what possible aspirations and anxieties of learners must be taken into account, what adult aspirations and attitudes they are likely to have, what are the probabilities of their future economic status and function. Because of these manifold concerns and issues, which are to be raised by representatives of the "learner" commonplace in curricular deliberation, issues of time will tend to play a secondary role. It is contended that the richness and complexities of time, viewed as a topic of study, deserve an independent voice in the process of education, so that possessors of knowledge and experience in the four commonplaces may make room in their thinking for the concerns and values related to time.

The acceptance of time as a fifth commonplace in curricular deliberations is expected to promote a more comprehensive and integrated treatment of the variety of time issues. The questions and problems that will be generated in the deliberations may, in turn, stimulate research on time. An important area of research on time is, for instance, teacher time. Leinhardt (1985) suggests that we need to understand teacher time if we wish to influence the way in which teachers get learners to use their time. Another issue of time to be studied, relevant to schooling, is the issue of gender differences in the perception of time.

Can we expect one expert to represent the variety of aspects of time? In that respect, time, as a commonplace, is not different from the other commonplaces. Rarely may we find one expert who is able to represent the many facets of learners, subject mater, milieu or teachers, respectively. Schwab (1973) notes that knowledge of social milieus, or of the development of children is produced in the variform disciplines of the behavioral sciences by different investigators, guided by differing conceptions of problem and method. Therefore, knowledge by one representative of any of the commonplaces, including time, may have to be complemented by other specialists in the field. Let us turn, now, to some of the practical implications of the notion of time as a commonplace.

## Practical Implications for Curriculum Development and Teacher Education

One of the first steps of implementing the notion of time as a commonplace is to introduce special courses on time in programs of

curriculum departments. This may be a way to create awareness to time issues in an integrated manner, as a complex and growing topic of study. A topic of study is not to be equated with a discipline. The study of learners, for example, is not confined to one discipline, yet, learners are a topic of study, and knowledge generated on this topic serves the curricular process. Students who will choose to do research on time may join the community of scholars investigating issues of time in education. Among these scholars representatives for the time commonplace will be found, who can participate in deliberations on curriculum and instruction, sharing and coordinating with others their knowledge of, and experience in, issues in education.

Another area for intervention "on behalf" of time as a commonplace is in teacher education programs. In line with the growing responsibilities assigned to teachers in the curriculum process (Schwab, 1983), and their role as curriculum adapters and implementors, it seems crucial to raise teachers' sensitivity to time as an important educational concern. Courses on time and exercises in the analysis of curricula and lesson settings, using a variety of "time" frameworks, may contribute to teachers' expertise in this domain.

Last, but not least, in the line of endeavors to stimulate the potential role of time as a commonplace, are scholarly conventions and meetings devoted to the concept of time in education. The establishment of regular meetings, and possible, journals dedicated to time, may pave the way for time to become a commonplace in curricular processes.

## References

Anderson, L. W. (1985). "Time and Learning." In C. W. Fisher and D. C. Berliner (Eds.), Perspectives in Instructional Time. New York and London: Longman.

Berliner, D. C. (1979). "Tempus Educare." In P. L. Peterson and H. I. Walberg (Eds.), Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bloom, B. S. (1974). "Time and Learning." American Psychologist, 29, 682-688.

Carroll, T. B. (1963). "A Model of School Learning." Teachers College Record, 64, 8, 723-633.

Condon, W. S. (1982). "Cultural Microrhythms." In M. Davies (Ed.), Interaction Rhythms: Periodicity in Communicative Behavior. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Connelly, F. M., and Clandinin, D. J. (1985). The cyclic temporal structure of schooling. Paper presented at the Symposium on: Classroom Studies of Teachers' Personal Knowledge, held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, December 9-11.

Durkheim, E. (1965). The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. New York: Basic Books.

Fernstermacher, G. D. "Time as the Terminus of Teaching: A Philosophical Perspective." In C. W. Fisher and D. C. Berliner (Eds.), Perspectives on Instructional Time. New York and London: Longman.

Fisher, C. W., and Berliner, D. C. (1985). Perspectives on Instructional Time. New York and London: Longman.

Fisher, C. W., Filby, N. N., Marliave, R. S., Cahen, L. W., Dishaw, M. M., Moore, G. E., and Berliner, D. C. (1978). Teaching Behaviors, Academic Learning Time, and Student Achievement. Technical Report, Vol. 1, Final Report of Phase III-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Gage, N. L. (1978). The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching. New York and London, Teacher College Press, Columbia University.

Harnischfeger, A., and Wiley, D. E. (1976). "The Teaching-Learning Process in Elementary Schools: A Synoptic View." Curriculum Inquiry, 6, 1, 5-43.

Jackson, P. W. (1977). "Looking into Education's Crystal Ball." Instructor, 87, 38, 38.

Karweit, N. (1985). "Time Scales, Learning Events and Productive Instruction." In C. W. Fisher and D. C. Berliner (Eds.), Perspectives on Instructional Time. New York and London: Longman.

Kendon, A. (1982). "Coordination of Actions and Framing in face-to-face Interaction." In M. Davis (Ed.), Interaction Rhythms: Periodicity in Communicative Behavior.

Kron, F. W. (1968). "Die Antinomie von Gegenwart und Zukunft in Erziehung und Unterricht." Westermanns Padagogische Beitrage, 20, 11, 587-593.

Leinhardt, G. (1985). "Instructional Time: A Winged Chariot." In C. W. Fisher and D. C. Berliner (Eds.), Perspectives on Instructional Time. New York and London: Longman.

Levin, H. M., Glass, G. V., and Meister, G. (1984). Cost-effectiveness of Four Educational Interventions, IFG Project Report No. 84-A11. School of Education, Stanford University, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.

Levin, H. M., and Tsang, M. C. (1984). The Economics of Student Time. Program Report No. 84-B9. Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education, Stanford University.

Martin, T. R. (1970). "The Disciplines and the Curriculum." In T. R. Martin (Ed.), Readings in the Philosophy of Education: A Study of Curriculum. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mathiot, M., and Carlock, E. (1982). "On Operationalization of the Notion of Rhythm in Social Behavior." In M. Davis (Ed.), Interaction Rhythms: Periodicity in Communicative Behavior. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Peters, R. S. (1967). Ethics and Education. Chicago: Scott, Foresman.

Rosenshine, B. V. (1979). "Content, Time and Direct Instructions." In P. L. Peterson and J. Walberg (Eds.), Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Schleiermacher, F. D. E. (1835-1864). Samtliche Werke. Berlin.

Schwab, J. J. (1964). "Problems, Topics and Issues." In S. Elam (Ed.), Education and the Structure of Knowledge. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Schwab, J. J. (1973). "The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum." School Review, 81, 501-522.

Schwab, J. J. (1983). "The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do." Curriculum Inquiry, 13, 3, 239-265.

Zerubavel, E. (1981). Hidden Rhythms: Schedules and Calendars in Social Life. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.